

IS THE SKY REALLY FALLING?: AN UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE K-5 CURRICULUM IN INDIANA

PHILLIP J. VANFOSSEN AND CHRIS MCGREW

Abstract

This study replicates a 2005 study of the status of social studies in the K-5 curriculum in Indiana.¹ The current study reports the results of a comprehensive survey (33 fixed and 2 open-ended) of a stratified (by grade) random sample of K-5 teachers in Indiana (n = 385; response rate = 32%). Results indicated a continued marginalization of social studies relative to other core areas (e.g. mathematics and English/language arts) as found in the previous study. Two of the three factors reported in the previous study still seem to play a role in this marginalization: (1) perceived level of administrative support for implementing social studies standards; and (2) lack of a state-wide high stakes assessment for social studies at the K-5 level. The third factor, teachers' lack of a clear understanding of the goals and mission of social studies may also be a contributing factor, but requires further analysis and will be discussed in another report. The current study provides a second point of reference that may indicate a trend. However, the report indicated that attitudes by teachers toward the social studies may be changing. The current study finds that respondents devoted less time to social studies instruction than they did in the previous study. This occurred despite the fact that more teachers were aware of and used the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies in their planning. As in the previous study, there was an association (albeit slightly weaker) between administrative support for social studies and time devoted to social studies instruction. The report concludes that the status of K-5 social studies education is worse than it was four years ago and that social studies in the Indiana K-5 curriculum is a discipline at risk.

Introduction

Prior to the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the social studies were losing ground in elementary classrooms, but NCLB reforms have contributed additional changes in kindergarten to fifth grade (K-5) curriculum.² These changes brought an increased focus on literacy and mathematics. There are claims that one consequence of this was the marginalization of social studies.³ In the first of a series of statewide studies

of K-5 social studies, VanFossen found that the instructional minutes respondents reported for teaching social studies were less than what national guidelines recommended and was notably less than was reported in earlier studies.⁴ Research in North Carolina found that this was also the case.⁵ In fact, studies done in South Carolina, Texas, California, and Illinois also reported that instructional minutes were being shifted away from the social studies to the tested areas of English/language arts and mathematics.⁶ The previous study reported baseline data that described the status of K-5 social studies in Indiana.⁷ In the current study, the authors use the same methods to determine if, and how, the status of social studies in the Indiana K-5 curriculum had changed over the four years between studies. The authors believe that it was important to position the current study prior to the implementation of a high-stakes assessment for social studies in Indiana elementary classrooms. The current study provides data that may be used to determine any long-term trends concerning the possible impact of educational reform efforts on elementary social studies. Studies done in other states have not provided the same long-term view, describing what may be considered short-term changes. The current study represents the second in a series of studies that looked at the impact of educational reform measures on elementary social studies in Indiana.

The previous study in Indiana found that respondents reported shifting instructional minutes from teaching social studies to other subjects, especially English/language arts and mathematics. Philip VanFossen suggests three possible reasons for this continued marginalization of social studies; (1) a perceived lack of administrative support, (2) the lack of a state-wide assessment of social studies concepts and skills, and (3) a lack of understanding of the goals and mission of the social studies.

The current study sought to determine, among other findings, if time devoted to social studies instruction was continuing to decline, and the degree to which the three factors listed above were still responsible.⁸ Social Studies content and skills appeared on the Indiana State Test of Educational Progress (ISTEP+) assessment for the first time in the spring of 2009. The authors believed that describing the status of social studies in grades K-5 prior to the implementation of the social studies assessment would provide a benchmark for post implementation comparison. The authors hope to conduct a similar study following the implementation of the assessment program to determine the impact of high-stakes social studies testing in Indiana elementary classrooms.

In the previous study, a questionnaire went out to a stratified random sample ($n=1200$) of all public K-5 teachers. This sample drew from an Indiana Department of Education data base of K-5 teachers for the 2002/03 school year. Two hundred teachers randomly chosen from each grade level and sent a packet that included a description of the research and a study questionnaire; 49.5 percent of the sample completed the survey. Among the research questions the previous study sought to examine were:

- How many minutes per week do elementary teachers in Indiana devote to social studies instruction?
- What priority do K-5 teachers and elementary administrators in Indiana assign (relative to other subjects and topics) to social studies education?
- To what extent are elementary school teachers (grades K-5) aware of the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies (IASSS) and to what degree do they use the IASSS in their planning and teaching?⁹

The results from the previous survey study implied that high-stakes testing had caused a shift in the teaching of social studies in K-5 classrooms in Indiana. The study found that nearly two-thirds of all respondents reported spending less than 90 minutes per week teaching social studies concepts and skills. Results were even worse at the primary

level (K-3), where respondents reported spending less than 60 minutes per week teaching social studies.¹⁰ Respondents in the previous study reported that this lack of attention to social studies instruction was a result of the need to spend more instructional time on areas tested by Indiana's high stakes test, the Indiana State Test of Educational Progress (ISTEP+). In fact, respondents claimed that if social studies was included on ISTEP+ assessments, they would devote significantly more time to teaching social studies. In addition, respondents in the previous study lamented the lack of administrator support for the teaching of social studies concepts and skills. VanFossen reported that this perceived lack of administrator support was moderately and significantly correlated to the number of instructional minutes respondents spent teaching the social studies. Finally, the previous study found that respondents ranked social studies fourth in importance behind English/language arts, mathematics, and science, all subjects currently tested on the ISTEP+ assessment.¹¹

The Indiana Context

Indiana's high-stakes, large-scale assessment is called the Indiana Statewide Test of Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+). At the time of both the previous and current studies, ISTEP+ did not contain tests of social studies concepts and skills at any grade level K-5. However, Indiana does have legislation that calls for balanced instruction across all curricular areas, including social studies. In fact, Indiana Code 20-10.1-4-4.5 (1995) calls for the integration of "good" citizenship instruction across all grades K-12. Indiana is just now beginning to include social studies on the ISTEP+. In the spring of 2009, Indiana implemented a version of the ISTEP+ that includes social studies concepts and skills at grades 5 and 7, in accordance with Indiana's accountability law, Public Law

221 (1999). Indiana 's State Board of Education adopted the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies in 2001, then revised them in 2007. These standards are comprehensive and have been given very high ratings by various constituent groups; schools in Indiana have been required to implement curriculum that ensures students can meet these standards. However, due to the nature of the school accountability formula, and the fact that professional development programs must be based on data (primarily ISTEP+ data), many schools are unable or unwilling to spend any professional time or resources on effectively using the IASSS, or improving social studies instruction in the elementary classroom.

Review of the Relevant Literature

Instructional Time Devoted to Social Studies

The status of social studies in the K-5 curriculum has long been a topic of study. For example, John Goodlad's seminal 1984 study, *A Place Called School*, examined the place of social studies in K-5 classrooms. Goodlad found that many educators did not think that social studies was essential in the elementary school, especially in the primary grades and that the social studies was among the least favorite subjects that elementary students faced.¹²

S. Thornton and R. Houser surveyed and interviewed administrators, team leaders, and curriculum specialists and found that primary (K-3) teachers in Delaware were spending as little as 20 minutes per day teaching social studies concepts and skills, and that Delaware teachers at the intermediate (4-5) level were only doing slightly better at 30 minutes per day.¹³ This was down from the 26 minutes for early elementary (K-3) and 46 minutes for upper elementary (grades 4-6) reported by Goodlad.¹⁴

M. Haas and M. Laughlin, in a survey of elementary teachers who were members of the National Council of the Social Studies, found that respondents feared that testing mandates in mathematics and English/language arts were changing the priority of social studies in the elementary curriculum.¹⁵ In the years since NCLB was implemented, a number of studies have found that the amount of instructional minutes teachers have reported devoting to social studies has continued to diminish.¹⁶

High stakes testing and instructional time

Several recent studies have examined the association between high-stakes testing and time devoted to K-5 social studies instruction. In one study, researchers in North Carolina used a survey administered through interviews and found that teachers reduced instructional minutes devoted to elementary social studies in order to make time for instruction in tested subjects.¹⁷ A study in South Carolina surveyed teachers and compared those findings with the earlier study in North Carolina and found that teachers were allocating time to teach tested subjects (e.g., English/language arts and mathematics) and reducing the time they taught social studies.¹⁸ The authors of this study also determined that K-5 teachers in South Carolina -- where social studies is part of the state-wide testing system -- reported devoting more time to social studies than teachers in North Carolina, where social studies is not tested.¹⁹ S. Burroughs compared data from North Carolina, Mississippi, and Texas and reported that time was being shifted away from social studies and other subjects to make time for test preparation in subjects recognized by NCLB.²⁰ J. Burstein found that instructional minutes were being shifted away from social studies in California classrooms because policy makers wanted increased instructional time for areas tested by NCLB.²¹ J. Margolis described how

teacher interns (student teachers) in urban Washington state elementary schools were struggling to teach social studies concepts and skills required by their university supervisors.²² This was because the interns did not have the time nor support of their supervising teachers because these concepts were not on the state assessment. K. Manzo found that teachers in Nevada, California, and Illinois were forced to shift minutes away from civics and history instruction in order to have more time to cover language arts and mathematics content that was covered on state assessments.²³

Ironically, as studies indicated that social studies was losing instructional time in the K-5 classroom, scholars argued that the skills and concepts students needed to learn in order to participate in society (and that social studies could provide) demanded more time. According to M. McGuire, time was required in order to connect the knowledge and skills students gained from social studies textbooks with the kind of civic participation a democratic society needed. McGuire reported that the instructional minutes needed to teach the skills and knowledge were not as available as in the past.²⁴ The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) report *The Civic Mission of Schools* states that shifting institutional support for social studies, budget cuts, and NCLB in general made it very difficult to implement meaningful civic education programs. The CIRCLE report found that teachers nationwide were finding it difficult to provide any kind of context for democratic education.²⁵ In addition, Theodore Rabb argued that a narrowing of the social studies curriculum due to NCLB was one possible reason for flat National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) history assessment scores.²⁶

K-5 Administrative Support for the Social Studies

VanFossen found that perceived administrative support could have a significant impact on how many minutes K-5 teachers devote to social studies instruction.²⁷ C. Von Zastrow and H. Janc used surveys from over nine hundred principals and found that 29 percent of them asked their teachers to shift instructional minutes away from social studies.²⁸ L. Hutton and J. Burstein reported that novice (i.e., student) K-5 teachers were frustrated because administrators only wanted them to teach science and mathematics and not cover concepts in history and social science.²⁹ J. Wills reported that many teachers simply choose to teach fewer social studies concepts and skills.³⁰ S. Grant claimed that such behavior indicated a defensive strategy; following signals from administrators, teachers opted to keep only what they thought was most important in the curriculum --- and this was not social studies.³¹ P. Pederson conducted a nation-wide survey of state-assessment directors and found problems caused by focusing testing on a narrow portion of the overall K-5 curriculum.³² T. Lintner sent the same survey used by Thornton and Houser to all elementary principals in South Carolina and reported that some principals believed that there should be more focus on social studies and that it may have dropped too far out of the curriculum.³³

Other studies have found that additional factors, such as tenure and availability of resources, could offset the influence administrators had on the time elementary teachers devoted to social studies instruction. S. Grant reported that the number of years a classroom teacher had in a building influenced how much perceived control he or she had over how they allocated their instructional time. This implied that the longer the teacher had been in a building the less likely they were influenced by administrator mandates

about how to use instructional time.³⁴ Similarly, J. Pace found that the type of resources available to the classroom teachers and their student-population influenced a teacher's ability to make instructional decisions.³⁵ L. Hutton and J. Burstein also found that teachers with more experience and a greater availability of resources found creative ways to bring social studies back into the curriculum where state-testing, or administrator, mandates had pushed it out.³⁶

Consequences of the Loss of K-5 Social Studies Instruction

Researchers have found that less time for social studies instruction and preparation may lead to lower teacher quality. For example, A. McCall reported that there were fewer exemplary teachers in the social studies because there was less time for improving social studies instruction.³⁷ J. Burstein, L. Hutton, and R. Curtis surveyed California elementary teachers and found them dissatisfied with the amount of preparation time that they had for social studies instruction.³⁸

J. Hoffman, L. Assaf, and S. Paris surveyed reading teachers in Texas and found that the very process of preparing students for the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) harmed students in urban districts. They reported that students' attitudes toward the social studies and learning had been negatively impacted because of large-scale, high-stakes, testing.³⁹ C. Parke and S. Lane reported that Maryland students' views on learning were influenced by the state-wide assessment, with some students believing that because social studies and science tests "didn't count" (in the Maryland assessment), it was not as important to do well on them.⁴⁰ K. Vogler and D. Virtue claimed that the relationship between students and teachers changed with high-stakes testing. They reported that many

teachers now sensed that their influence on students was less important than how well the students did on the assessment.⁴¹

Research Questions

The present study sought to replicate the previous study and determine what, if any, changes may have occurred in the past four years in terms of the status of K-5 social studies in Indiana. The current study examines instructional minutes devoted to social studies instruction, as well as teacher and student attitudes toward social studies concepts and skills. As noted previously, beginning in the 2008/09 school year, social studies concepts and skills were to be tested as part of the ISTEP+ assessment plan in grades 5 and 7. This change would make it possible to determine if instructional minutes devoted to teaching social studies would change with the addition of social studies to the ISTEP+ assessment.

The current study modified the research questions from the previous study. The questions for the current study were:

1. How many minutes per week do elementary teachers in Indiana devote to social studies instruction? How has this changed in the last four years?
2. What priority do K-5 teachers and elementary administrators in Indiana give (relative to other subjects and topics) to social studies curriculum? Has this changed with the inclusion of social studies concepts and skills on the 2009 ISTEP+ assessment?
3. To what extent are elementary school teachers (grades K-5) in Indiana aware of the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies (IASSS) and to what degree do

they use the IASSS in their planning and teaching? Has this changed in the last four years?

Methods

In order to investigate these questions, the authors replicated the previous survey study.⁴² Nearly all of the survey questions used in the previous study were repeated and updated in the current study. The author created a survey instrument using an online survey system. This online, web-based system simplified the collection of data, as well as decreased the number of mailings, saving postage on the return survey mailing. It also allowed the authors to access data in both hypertext and spreadsheet formats.

The survey included thirty-three fixed choice and two open ended items. The first section of the instrument asked questions that focused on how much respondents used the Indiana Academic Standards for Social Studies (IASSS), as well as instructional strategies and time spent teaching social studies concepts and skills. This portion of the survey also asked the respondents about their perception of the administrative support they received for teaching social studies. The second section of the survey included questions about the respondent's educational background, school demographics, and the priority respondents gave to teaching social studies. Two open-ended questions in this part of the survey asked about the respondent's rationale for teaching social studies and asked for comments that they might have about teaching social studies or the survey in general. The survey may be found in Appendix A or accessed online at

https://research.education.purdue.edu/surveys/survey.asp?survey_id=VANFOSS8/9/2007

Participants in the current study were selected using a stratified (by grade) random sample drawn from a list of K-5 teachers for the 2006-2007 school year generated by the

Indiana Department of Education (n=1200). Two hundred names and school addresses were generated for each grade level from kindergarten through 5th grade using the random number generator function of Microsoft Excel®. Each participant was sent an invitation letter describing the study and providing directions for completing the online survey. A small stipend of \$1.00 was included in order to improve the response rate. Two postcard reminders were mailed to those participants who had not responded: the first four weeks after the initial mailing; the second four weeks later.

The final response rate was 378/1200, or 31.5 percent. This rate was well below the 49.5 percent rate reported for the previous study. This may be explained by issues common to on-line surveys. For example, M. Van Selm and N. Jankowski reported that some potential respondents to on-line surveys were concerned about confidentiality or by the way the survey goals were presented.⁴³ C. Wharton, J. Hampl, R. Hall, and D. Winham, reported that potential respondents had trouble completing online surveys.⁴⁴

Table 1. Study sample and response rates.

Grade	Number sampled	Number respondents
K	200	60
1	200	63
2	200	63
3	200	81
4	200	52
5	200	66
Totals	1,200	385

Regardless of the cause, however, such non-response can be problematic in survey research. M. Kano, T. Franke, Abdelmonem A. Afifi, and L. Bourqu reported that non-response can cause bias because certain populations (e.g., teachers in urban schools) may be less likely to respond to surveys than other populations.⁴⁵ If strategies for dealing with non-response are not discussed, questions may arise about the outcome measures for these and other populations. Recognizing the problems associated with failing to address non-response, the authors attempted to determine if the respondents who did not complete the survey initially differed in any significant way from those who did. After twelve weeks, the authors randomly selected fifteen non-respondents and attempted to contact them: first by phone, then by a three email messages, and finally by phone again. M. Kano and others, described this method as “the most direct method of comparing respondents with non-respondents on substantive variables.”⁴⁶ The authors were able to gather data from eight of the fifteen randomly selected non-respondents. The subsequent analysis indicated that the data collected from non-respondents did not differ significantly from those data collected initially. These final eight respondents were added to the initial group bringing the total responses to 385 (32.1 percent).

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS*) version 15.0 was used to analyze data from the fixed-response items. In order to answer the three research questions, the authors calculated frequency distributions, medians and modes for all relevant variables. Correlation coefficients for ordinal scales (using Kendall’s *Tau-b* for ordinal data) and non-parametric analysis (Wilcoxon signed ranks and Chi-square tests)

were used to compare results from the current study with those of the previous study and to test for significance.

Results

Demographics

In general, the demographics of the respondents for the current study were similar to those of the respondents in the previous study. For example, in the previous study, 68.6 percent of the respondents had ten or more years of teaching experience, and 81.1 percent had taught for at least five years. In the current study, those teaching ten or more years had fallen to 57.5 percent, but those with five or more years increased to 81.5 percent. As reported in the previous study, an overwhelming majority was female: 89.5 percent in previous study and 87 percent in current study. In the current study the respondents were overwhelmingly white and non-Hispanic (91.2 percent), with only 3.9 percent African-American compared to 93 percent and 4.8 percent in the previous study. This is closely representative of the general demographic of elementary teachers in Indiana. A vast majority of the respondents in the current study held at least a bachelor's degree plus 15 hours (80.8 percent), but this number was down from the previous study (85.5 percent). In the current study, 63.4 percent of the respondents held at least a master's degree, up from 61.3 percent in the previous study. The largest majority of teachers received their license through a four-year teacher preparation program in the current study (80.1 percent). This was up from 77.4 percent reported in the previous study. In the current study, 14.1 percent of the respondents received their license through a master's degree program (compared to 18.3 percent in the previous study), with 2.5 percent gaining it through a post-baccalaureate program (compared to 3.9 percent in the previous study).

The majority of the respondents (59.7 percent) of the respondents of the current study described their students as coming from either a lower-middle or lower socio-economic setting, compared to 58.5 percent in the previous study.

The authors asked the respondents in the current study to estimate how many minutes they spent each week teaching social studies concepts and skills. For purposes of comparison with the previous study, respondents were separated into primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-5) levels. Results indicated that significantly less time was devoted to social studies instruction in the current study than in the previous study ($\chi^2=18.806$; $p=0.027$). (See Table 2.)

For example, results indicated nearly 3/4 (72.5 percent) of the primary (K-3) respondents reported that they were spending less than 90 minutes each week teaching social studies (less than 18 minutes per day). Compared to the previous study, the median range of instructional time reported by K-3 respondents dropped to 21-40 minutes per week (from 61-90 minutes), while the modal response remained at 21-40 minutes per week. As in the previous study, lack of state-wide testing was cited as a major reason for not giving equal time to social studies instruction. Respondents were asked one question about how much time they currently devote to social studies instruction and another about how much time they would devote if it were part of the ISTEP+ program. The responses suggested that, as in the previous study, respondents would devote more time to social studies if it was part of the ISTEP+ assessment. The increase between the median level times devoted to social studies instruction if it was tested was significant across both K-3 (Wilcoxin signed ranks test; $z=-9.135$; $p<0.001$); and 4-5 respondents ($z=-5.506$; $p<0.001$). (See Tables 2 and 3)

Table 2. Estimated Weekly Time devoted to Social Studies Instruction for Grades K-3

N=267	0-20 mins.	21-40	41-60	61-90	91-120	121 – 150	More than 150	Median	Mode
Current weekly instructional time devoted to social studies								21 to 40 mins.(a)	21 to 40 mins.
Frequency	53	78	66	34	21	11	1		
Percentage	19.5	28.7	24.3	12.5	7.7	4.0	.4		
Weekly time devoted if social studies on ISTEP*								41 to 60 mins.(b)	41 to 60 mins.
Frequency	19	58	69	61	34	17	7		
Percentage	7.0	21.3	25.4	22.4	12.5	6.3	2.6		

*Wilcoxon signed ranks test indicates a significant increase in reported weekly time devoted to social studies. ($Z=-9.135$; $p<.001$).

(a) changes from 2004 to 2008 are significant. ($\chi^2=18.806$; $p=0.027$).

(b) changes from 2004 to 2008 are not significant. ($\chi^2=12.671$; $p=0.124$).

Table 3. Estimated Weekly Time devoted to Social Studies Instruction for Grades 4-5

N=118	0-20 mins.	21-40	41-60	61-90	91-120	121 – 150	More than 150	Median	Mode
Current weekly instructional time devoted to social studies								91 to 120 mins.(a)	121 to 150 mins.
Frequency	5	12	15	12	23	27	24		
Percentage	4.2	10	12.5	10	19.2	22.5	20		
Weekly time								121 to 150	More than

devoted if social studies on ISTEP*								mins.(b)	150 mins
Frequency	2	3	16	13	22	32	32		
Percentage	1.7	2.5	13.3	10.8	18.3	26.7	26.7		

*Wilcoxon signed ranks test indicates a significant increase in reported weekly time devoted to social studies. ($Z=-5.506$; $p<.001$).

(a) changes from 2004 to 2008 are not significant. ($\chi^2=15.809$; $p=0.071$).

(b) changes from 2004 to 2008 are not significant. ($\chi^2=8.229$; $p=0.313$).

Respondents from grades 4 and 5 also reported decreases in instructional minutes devoted to social studies. Table 3 shows the modal range decreased from more than 150 minutes to 121-150 minutes and the median range decreased to 91-120 from 121 to 150 ($\chi^2=15.809$; $p=0.071$).

Support for Social Studies

As in the previous study, respondents were asked to rank content areas in terms of their perception of social studies importance in the overall curriculum (See Table 4). In the current study, the proportion of K-3 respondents who ranked English/language arts as the most important content area increased significantly from 84.1 percent to 96.1 percent ($\chi^2=47.552$; $p<0.001$). Conversely, only 1.2 percent of the K-3 respondents in the current study ranked social studies as the most important subject and this was a significant decrease from the previous study ($\chi^2=24.134$; $p<0.001$). At the 4th and 5th grade level, 89.4 percent of the current respondents ranked English/language arts as most important, down from 90 percent in the previous study. Only 0.9 percent claimed that social studies was the most important, and this was also down from the previous study.

Table 4 shows the mean rankings by grade level for each content area across the two studies. The mean ranking of social studies by primary (K-3) teachers was lower in

the current study than in the previous study. However, the mean ranking of social studies by intermediate (4-5) teachers was slightly higher in the current study. At the same time, there was a significant increase in the average ranking of English/language arts by primary (K-3) respondents ($t= 3.743$; $p=.000$) but no significant change in the average ranking of English/language arts for intermediate (4-5) respondents. These results imply that, in the current study, teachers ranked social studies as less important and English/language arts as more important than the respondents in the previous study.

Table 4. Respondents ranking of importance of content/subject areas

Subject area	Mean ranking*			
	VanFossen (2005)		Current study	
	K-3	4-5	K-3	4-5
English/language arts	5.58	5.83	5.87	5.75
Mathematics	4.89	5.03	4.96	5.01
Science	3.47	3.67	3.52	3.57
Social Studies	3.44	3.44	3.30	3.50
Music/Art	1.77	1.54	1.81	1.95
Health/PE	2.37	2.55	2.15	2.24

* 6 = most important; 1 = least important

The previous study found that there was a significant correlation between respondents' perceptions of their building-level administrators' support for the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies (IASSS) and for social studies as a subject area, and the number of minutes respondents devoted to teaching social studies concepts and skills. The previous study found that while few of the respondents claimed administrators told them explicitly not to teach the IASSS or social studies, over 40 percent of the primary respondents felt that their building-level administrator gave little or no support for the teaching of social studies. Table 5 compares the association between minutes devoted to social studies instruction by respondents and the respondents' perception of building administration value and support for social studies for both the previous and current study.

Table 5. Correlation coefficients: Minutes devoted to social studies by building administration value and support for social studies.

	Weekly minutes devoted to social studies instruction			
	VanFossen (2005)		Current Study	
	K-3	4-5	K-3	4-5
Value building administration places on social studies at grade level? (4 = high value; 1 = told not to teach)	.329**	.292**	.172**	.256**
Support for teaching IASSS at grade level? (4 = excellent support; 1 = no support)	.211**	.190**	.114	.227**

**p<.001; Kendall's *tau-b* for ordinal data.

The data in Table 5 indicate that respondent perceptions of administrative support for the teaching of social studies still matters. There was a significant association between the perception of the building principal's support for the social studies and the

instructional minutes devoted to social studies reported by K-3 teachers in that building. For grades 4 and 5 there was a significant association between instructional minutes devoted to social studies and both the principal's support for teaching the IASSS and for social studies generally. These data suggested that teachers who perceived administrative support were more likely to spend greater time teaching social studies concepts and skills.

These results also imply the opposite: the less administrative support, the less social studies is taught. Indeed, in some cases, the lack of support for the teaching of social studies was more than a perception. For example, here are several illustrative responses to the open-ended question on the survey instrument:

Soc[ial] Stud[ies] is not valued in our corporation. We have been told that due to ISTEP teach reading and Math first and most of the day a[n]d if there is time left over, that is for Science or Soc[ial] Studies.

Our principal has decided that we do not teach social studies and science content. Instead she wants us to teach students how to use the book and parts of the book. It is called informational text strategies. We teach them what the table of contents, glossary, index, and etc. are. We also teach them how to use the parts of the book. We have not taught social studies and science content for two years. She is more interested in the students learning how to read and use the informational textbook than the actual content of the books.

Because of ISTEP, No Child Left Behind, and School Improvement (NCA), teachers have been left out of the planning part of teaching. I am told to spend my day teaching language arts and math only.

Instructional Time Devoted to Social Studies

The balanced curriculum mandated by the Indiana Department of Education demands that students learn social studies concepts and skills in the same way that they learn concepts and skills in English/language arts, mathematics, and science.⁴⁷ Given the typical make-up of the school day, this should translate into approximately five hours per week, or approximately one hour per day devoted to social studies instruction. Previous

studies have shown that this is not always the case in Indiana or elsewhere. J. Goodlad found that primary elementary teachers (K-3) spent approximately 2.09 hours (25 minutes per day) per week in social studies instruction, while intermediate teachers (grade 4-6) spent slightly more time at 3.83 hours (46 minutes per day).⁴⁸ S. Thornton and N. Houser reported that primary teachers devoted an average of 100 minutes per week (20 minutes per day) teaching social studies, with intermediate teachers devoting 150 minutes per week (30 minutes per day).⁴⁹ J. Finklestein, L. Nielsen, and T. Switzer found that the mean and median range of time teachers used for teaching social studies concepts and skills to be only 76-100 minutes per week.⁵⁰ VanFossen found the median time Indiana K-3 teachers spent in social studies instruction to be 61-90 minutes per week, with intermediate teachers spending between 121 and 150 minutes per week.⁵¹ T. Rock and others found that North Carolina elementary teachers spent 30-45 minutes three times per week.⁵² T. Heafner and others found that South Carolina elementary teachers spent 30-45 minutes per three to five times per week.⁵³

Table 6 places the current study into this historical perspective. The instructional minutes devoted to social studies reported by Goodlad seem to have been a high water mark.⁵⁴ Instructional minutes reported in Finkelstein, Thornton, Houser, VanFossen, and others reported fewer instructional minutes devoted to social studies.⁵⁵ This trend seems to have continued with Rock, and the current study, as Table 6 suggests.⁵⁶ While the model time-range for K-3 teachers remained the same in the current study, the model range for grades 4-5 fell from more than 150 minutes per week to 121-150 minutes per week.

Table 6. Comparison of average or modal time devoted to social studies instruction.

	Average or modal time range devoted to social studies instruction (minutes/week)					
Grade levels	Goodlad (1984)	Finkelstein, Nielsen, and Switzer (1993)	Thornton and Houser (1996)	VanFossen (2005)	Rock, et. al. (2006)	Current Study
Primary (K-3)	125.4	76 to 100	97	21 to 40	15-30	21 to 40
Intermediate (4-5)	229.8	---	148	More than 150	30 – 45	121 to 150

Discussion

As the current study was a replication, findings will be presented in comparison with the previous study, (VanFossen has elsewhere reported four major results).⁵⁷ In order to facilitate comparison with the current study, each of the previous study's three major findings will be summarized in an italicized statement followed by a discussion of results from the current study. The first comparison focuses on the priority of social studies in terms of instructional minutes respondents devoted to social studies instruction.

*“What is striking about the results of this study, in light of the previous findings, is the degree to which social studies appears to take an even lower priority in Indiana than in other states, or across the national samples... Indeed, the modal time range devoted to social studies instruction by primary (K-3) respondents was one-half to one-third the average time reported by respondents in these other studies.”*⁵⁸

As noted earlier, the modal time reported by respondents in the current study remained unchanged, but there was a significant decrease in the overall time primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-5) teachers reported devoting to social studies instruction. One concern that remains from the earlier study is that even with the perceived threat of a 5th grade social studies test appearing on the ISTEP+ assessment in 2009, primary teachers (K-3)

appeared to be borrowing even more instructional time from the social studies for remediating English/language arts, and mathematics. Given findings of Rock, Heafner, Burroughs, Burstein, and others, this is not surprising.⁵⁹ Indiana appears to be following the trend seen nationally.

There was still a clear relationship between administrators' support for social studies and the instructional time respondents reported devoting to social studies. The previous study reported that this relationship was strong and significant. However, in the current study, the relationship appeared to be less strong and was, in some cases, not significant. This sentiment was, however, clearly reflected in some open-ended item responses for the current study.

I wish I could spend more time teaching social studies, but our school is on probation through PL 221 and the NCLB act. Because of this, I needed to add more time in reading, writing, and math. Something had to give. Unfortunately, science and social studies have had to go.

We do not spend a lot of time on Social Studies because we are to be focused on what is tested on the ISTEP. Maybe if Social Studies was tested, we would spend more time on that subject.

I unfortunately don't teach much in the way of Soc[ial] Studies due to the emphasis placed on passing language arts and math on the ISTEP.

“Respondents ranked social studies as the fourth most important of the four ‘core’ subject areas and only slightly ahead of the two main enrichment subjects. One might ask whether elementary social studies in Indiana is on the verge of moving out of the ‘core’ and into the enrichment category, and if so, why this is the case.”⁶⁰

In the current study, elementary teacher respondents continued to rank social studies fourth (and last) relative to the other core subjects. In fact, compared to the previous study, a significantly larger percentage of primary teacher respondents (K-3) ranked English/language arts as the most important subject, with a significantly lower percentage

ranking social studies as the most important subject in the elementary curriculum.

However, there was a slight increase in the mean ranking of social studies by intermediate teacher respondents (grades 4 and 5). This may suggest that social studies is moving back into the intermediate curriculum in Indiana. Clearly, even though social studies still ranked last of the four core disciplines in the elementary classroom, intermediate respondents appeared to value social studies more than those in the previous study. Although the results of the current study appear to be mixed, it is important to note that compared to the previous study, the overall position continued to decline relative to other core content areas.

“This premise was supported...to some degree, by the fact that both primary and intermediate grade teacher respondents indicated that, on average, they would be teaching more social studies if it were tested on the ISTEP.”⁶¹

The third finding of the previous study linked time devoted to social studies instruction with the possibility of high stakes testing. In both studies, there was significant increase in the median and modal time respondents indicated they would devote to social studies instruction if social studies were to be tested on the ISTEP+. As the state-wide testing period approaches, some intermediate teachers may be looking for ways to reinsert social studies back into the instructional day.

For example, one teacher wrote...

The survey interests me because we have schools in our district where the teachers have been told to not use the SS text and to not have a SS block of time on the schedule. If SS is taught it must be during a reading lesson. An email was sent district-wide earlier this year to tell teachers to make sure that they are now to make sure that SS is taught. As the ISTEP goes, so goes instruction. I'll be glad to see SS on the ISTEP because SS will gain importance again in the classroom.

Integration as an answer

A number of the responses to the open-ended questions described opportunities to integrate social studies concepts and skills into other content areas, primarily in English/language arts. This is reflected in an increase in the percentage of all respondents who reported integration as a general approach to social studies instruction (previous K-3 teachers 59.2 percent; current K-3 teachers 63.5 percent; previous 4/5 teachers 27.7 percent; current 4/5 teachers 33.6 percent). One finding from the previous study suggested that a relatively high number of respondents reported that they either rarely teach social studies or only when they have time left over (11.4 percent for primary grade teachers and 3.8 percent for intermediate grade teachers. In the current study, those numbers remained at 11.6 percent and 6.7 percent respectively (See Table 7).

These results suggest that due to time constraints and lack of perceived administrative support, more teachers reported integrating social studies concepts and skills into other content areas. A number of respondents mentioned this issue in their open-ended responses, as illustrated by this quotation:

If I did not integrate social studies into my language arts curriculum, it would not be taught. Every year my administration is requiring teachers to devote more time to Language Arts and Math. Social studies is never mentioned by administrators and will probably not be an issue until it appears on the ISTEP test.

Table 7. General approach to teaching social studies by grade cluster.

<i>Statement</i>	VanFossen (2005)		Current Study	
	K-3 (n=361)	4-5 (n=184)	K-3 (n=267)	4-5 (n=118)
Social studies topics and content are integrated throughout the curriculum.	59.2	27.7	63.5	33.6
Social studies topics and content are taught at a	28.3	66.8	24.2	59.5

particular time.				
Social studies topics and content are taught when I have time left over.	9.2	2.7	8.5	5.2
I rarely teach social studies topics or content.	2.2	1.1	3.1	1.7

Integration of social studies within other content areas may be a short-term solution for teachers to justify continuing to teach social studies concepts and skills. L. Boyle-Baise, M. Hsu, S. Johnson, S. Serriere, and D. Stewart reported that elementary school administrators suggested that integration was the most effective way to include non-tested areas (such as social studies) in the elementary curriculum.⁶²

One positive finding from the current study was that teachers seemed more aware of the Indiana Academic Standards for the Social Studies. An area of concern expressed in the previous study was that more than 40 percent of the respondents reported they either lacked familiarity with, or ignored altogether, the IASSS. In the current study, a greater proportion of respondents reported familiarity with, and use of, the IASSS. Overall, only 8.8 percent of the respondents reported that they were either vaguely familiar or ignorant of the IASSS, and only 15.7 percent of respondents of the current study reported that they rarely or never consulted the IASSS when they planned their curriculum. These numbers represented a significant decrease from the previous study ($\chi^2=12.431$; $p=.014$).

The previous study found that one reason for the marginalization of social studies in Indiana could have been lack of a clear rationale for teaching social studies. In the previous study, VanFossen reported that respondents gave ten different rationale

statements for teaching social studies.⁶³ This lack of a clear definition of social studies was still evident in the current study open-ended responses. However, some additional responses raised concerns. For example, a few respondents wrote that the rationale for teaching social studies was to provide a “foundation” for classes that they would take later. Others wanted to give students a “jumpstart” for future studies. While it is important to determine what these words mean and, more importantly, to determine these respondents’ rationale for teaching the social studies, the current study does not report this analysis.

In addition, almost 11 percent of the respondents claimed that either they did not have time to teach social studies concepts and skills, or were forbidden from doing so by a building-level or district-level administrator. These results are cause for still more concern, especially given the mandate from the Indiana Department of Education about providing a balanced curriculum in the elementary classroom. This finding could be important for the future state of elementary social studies education.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The current study found that respondents devoted less time to social studies than they did in the previous study. This demonstrates that the marginalization of Indiana K-5 social studies is continuing, as has been reported in other states (e.g., North Carolina).⁶⁴ Respondents also reported that they taught less social studies in order to find time to prepare students in subject-tested on the large-scale state assessments.⁶⁵ Coupled with this decrease in minutes devoted to social studies instruction was an overall decrease of respondents’ ranking of the importance of social studies relative to other core subjects.

Although these results were not entirely unexpected, they were somewhat surprising given the current study's finding that a significantly greater percentage of respondents reported being either familiar with, or using the IASSS, for planning their curriculum. Results were also surprising in that the current study found - as in the previous study - teachers would devote significantly more time to social studies were it on the ISTEP+. Given the inclusion of social studies on the 2009 ISTEP+, the authors expected to see an even greater increase in instructional minutes devoted to social studies. Clearly this was not the case. It is possible that in a follow-up to the current study, teachers may report an increase in instructional minutes as a function of the 5th grade assessment. In particular, this might be an expected result reported by teachers in grades 4 and 5.

VanFossen found that the perception of administrator support for social studies meant that respondents reported more time devoted to social studies.⁶⁶ The current study found similar results in that there continued to be a significant association between the perceived level of building level support and minutes devoted to social studies instruction in that building. Given this, as well as the issues noted above, it seems reasonable to conclude that the decrease in minutes devoted to social studies instruction was due, at least in part, to a perceived decrease in administrative support. For example, here are several illustrative responses to the open ended question on the survey instrument:

As a [large urban district] teacher we are stressing on [teaching] reading, math, and science. We take benchmarks every 4 and 1/2 weeks. The tests are being watched by the downtown office. Teachers are very stressed to get the scores to go up. I only teach social studies if it is in my reading book and weekly readers. I would like to say that social studies in elementary school is quickly dissolving. Many principals are trying to get away from teaching social studies in the classroom and want teachers to focus on reading comprehension for social studies.

I've taught 35 years. We used to have a S[ocial] S[tudies] BOOK at least, to guide our teaching. That was taken away (and I mean that seriously, we were not ALLOWED to keep them!) about 4-5 yrs ago.

Is it possible that there are other factors that contributed to the decrease in instructional minutes? Could it be that teachers are becoming so overburdened by the increasing demands of high-stakes accountability that they no longer care whether or not the building principal supports the teaching of a non-tested subject? Could it be that building principal support is just one source of motivation for teachers when they make instructional decisions? If this is the case, could it be that the building principal's leadership is having a smaller impact than other factors on the instructional decisions teacher are making? As in the previous study, teachers reported that they would spend more time teaching social studies concepts and skills if it became part of the state-wide assessment program. As social studies become a part of the ISTEP+ assessment in 2009, will the time Indiana K-5 teachers devote to teaching social studies concepts and skills increase? Only time and more data collection will provide answers to these questions.

Teachers are finding ways to cope with the addition of social studies to the ISTEP+ statewide assessment program. Integration seems to be a choice of both teachers and administrators. In fact, the percentage of teachers who reported using integration as a tool for covering social studies content and skills increased from the previous study. However, there is some question as to whether what is being called social studies integration in K-5 classrooms is truly that, and whether such integration is effective social studies instruction.⁶⁷ If respondents are claiming that the time they devoted to integrating social studies with their English/language arts instruction counts as social studies instructional minutes, then the results reported in this survey may be overstated. In fact, if

the integration identified by the respondents does not truly focus on social studies concepts and skills, than these results may be even worse than reported here. More research should be done to define what effective integration looks like in the elementary social studies classroom and to measure the effectiveness of integration as pedagogy for learning social studies concepts and skills.

The previous study concluded that social studies in Indiana was being, “marginalized - or ‘bumped’ out of the curriculum.”⁶⁸ Based on the results of the current study, the status of K-5 social studies in Indiana is even worse than it was four years ago. The authors have concluded that the state of K-5 social studies education is in crisis and that elementary social studies is a discipline “at risk.” In order to insure that social studies remain relevant in the elementary classroom, something must be done quickly. Is it time for a statewide call to arms?

K. O’Connor, T. Heafner, and E. Groce issued a call for social studies educators to become involved in the current conversation about education reform.⁶⁹ They provide three strategies for advocacy. The authors encourage social studies supporters to contact or visit elected officials and share stories about the marginalization of social studies. They also call for more research that might provide evidence of the impact of the accountability programs on elementary schools. Finally they urged active participation by the social studies network in the development of large-scale assessment programs as well as a general reformation of testing programs.

Some questions still need answered. What will social studies instruction look like at the K-5 level after the ISTEP+ assessment is fully implemented at grade 5? Another study will be needed. This will provide another data point and allow the authors to

identify any trends. If social studies instruction begins to move back into the K-5 classroom, what changes will take place in order to make room, especially at the K-3 level? In addition, how is integration defined in the K-5 social studies classroom? Once this is determined, a concerted effort should begin to describe methods of effective integration in the K-5 social studies classroom.

NOTES

¹ P. VanFossen, "'Reading And Math Take So Much of The Time...': An Overview of Social Studies Instruction In Elementary Classrooms In Indiana," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 33 no. 3 (2005): 376-403.

² J. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Promise for the Future* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1984); S. Thornton and N. Houser, "The Status Of The Elementary Social Studies in Delaware: Views From the Field" (ERIC document number 404 239, 1996).

³ K. Manzo, "Social Studies Losing Out to Reading, Math," *Education Week* 24 no. 27 (2005): 1, 16-17.

⁴ VanFossen, 2005.

⁵ T. Rock, T. Heafner, K. O'Connor, J. Passe, S. Oldendorf, and A. Good, "One State Closer to a National Crisis: A Report on Elementary Social Studies Education in North Carolina Schools. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 34 no. 4 (2006): 455-83.

⁶ Center on Education Policy *Instructional Time in Elementary Schools a Closer Look at Changes for Specific Subjects*. (Washington D.C.: Center on Education Policy, 2008), <http://www.cep-dc.org>; J. Burstein, L. Hutton and R. Curtis, "The State of Elementary Social Studies Teaching in One Urban District," *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 30 no. 1 (2006): 15-20; Manzo, 2005.

⁷ VanFossen, 2005.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., p. 378.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Goodlad, 1984.

¹³ Thornton and Houser, 1996.

¹⁴ Goodlad, 1984.

¹⁵ M. Haas and M. Laughlin, "A Profile of Elementary Social Studies Teachers and Their Classrooms," *Social Education* 65 no. 2 (2001): 122-26.

¹⁶ Burstein, Hutton and Curtis, 2006; Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006; VanFossen, 2005; S. Burroughs, E. Groce, and M. Webeck, "Social Studies Education in the Age of Testing and Accountability," *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 24 no. 3 (2005): 13-20.

¹⁷ Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006.

¹⁸ T. Heafner, G. Lipscomb, and T. Rock, "To Test or Not to Test?: The Role of Testing in Elementary Social Studies: A Collaborative Study Conducted by NCPSSSE and SCPSSSE" *Social Studies Research and Practice* 1 no. 2 (2006).

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Burroughs, Groce, and Webeck, 2005.

²¹ Burstein, Hutton, and Curtis, 2006.

²² J. Margolis, "New Teachers, High Stakes Diversity, and the Performance-Based Conundrum," *The Urban Review*, 38 no. 1 (2006): 27-44.

²³ Manzo, 2005.

-
- ²⁴ M. McGuire, "What Happened to Social Studies? The Disappearing Curriculum" *Phi, Delta Kappan* 88 no. 8 (2007): 620-24.
- ²⁵ The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, "The Civic Mission of Schools," (MD, Silver Springs: National Council for the Social Studies, 2006) http://civicmissionofschoools.org/site/campaign/cms_report.html.
- ²⁶ T. Rabb, "Those Who Do Not Learn History . . .," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53 no. 42 (2007): 2.
- ²⁷ VanFossen, 2005.
- ²⁸ C. Von Zastrow and H. Janc, *Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools* (New York: Council for a Basic Education, Carnegie Corporation of New York, (2004) http://www.music-for-all.org/documents/cbe_principal_Report.pdf.
- ²⁹ L. Hutton and J. Burstein, J. (2008). "The Teaching of History-Social Science: Left Behind or Behind Closed Doors?" *Social Studies Research and Practice* 3 no. 1 (2008): 96-108.
- ³⁰ J. Wills, "Putting the Squeeze on Social Studies: Managing Teaching Dilemmas in Subject Areas Excluded From State Testing" *Teachers College Record*, 109 no. 8 (2008): 1980-2046.
- ³¹ S. Grant, "High Stakes Testing: How are Social Studies Teachers Responding?" *Social Education*, 71 no. 5 (2007): 250-54.
- ³² P. Pederson, "What is Measured is Treasured: The Impact of The No Child Left Behind Act on Non-Assessed Subjects" *The Clearing House* 80 no. 6 (2007): 287-291.
- ³³ T. Lintner, "Social Studies on the Back Burner: Perceptions and Practices of K-5 Social Studies Instruction," *Journal of Social Studies Research* 30 no. 1 (2006): 3-8.
- ³⁴ Grant, 2007.
- ³⁵ J. Pace, "Inequalities in History-Social Science Teaching Under High-Stakes Accountability: Interviews with Fifth Grade Teachers in California," *Social Studies Research and Practice* 3 no. 1 (2008): 24-40.
- ³⁶ Hutton and Burstein, 2008.
- ³⁷ A. McCall, "Supporting Elementary Social Studies Teaching in Elementary Schools," *The Social Studies* 97 no. 4 (2006): 161-67.
- ³⁸ Burstein, Hutton and Curtis, 2006.
- ³⁹ J. Hoffman, L. Assaf, and S. Paris, "High Stakes Testing in Reading: Today in Texas, Tomorrow?" *Reading Teacher* 54 no. 5 (2001): 482-93.
- ⁴⁰ C. Parke and S. Lane, "Students' Perceptions of Maryland State Performance Assessment," *Elementary School Journal* 107 no. 3 (2007): 305-24.
- ⁴¹ K. Vogler and D. Virtue, "Just the facts, Ma'am", Teaching Social Studies in the Era of Standards and High-Stakes Testing," *The Social Studies*, 98 no. 2 (2007): 54-58.
- ⁴² VanFossen, 2005
- ⁴³ M. Van Selm N. and Jankowski, "Conducting Online Surveys," *Quality & Quantity* 40 no. 3 (2006): 435-56.
- ⁴⁴ C. Wharton, J. Hampl, R. Hall and D. Winham, "PCs or Paper and Pencil: Online Surveys for Data Collection," *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 103 no.11 (2003): 1458-59.
- ⁴⁵ M. Kano, T. Franke, A. Abdelmonem and L. Bourqu, "Adequacy of Reporting Results of School Surveys and Nonresponse Effects: A Review of the Literature and a Case Study," *Educational Researcher* 37 no. 8 (2008): 480-89.
- ⁴⁶ Kano, Franke, Abdelmonem and Bourqu, p. 481.
- ⁴⁷ This is described in Indiana Administrative Code - 511 IAC 6.1-2 through 511 IAC 6.1-6 stating that social studies must be part of the K-5 classroom experience (Curriculum Verification Checklists and Policy-Assurance Forms, 2008).
- ⁴⁸ Goodlad, 1984.
- ⁴⁹ Thornton and Houser, 1996.
- ⁵⁰ J. Finkelstein, L. Nielsen, and T. Switzer, "Primary Elementary Social Studies Instruction: A Preliminary Report" *Social Education* 57, no. 2 (1993): 64-69.
- ⁵¹ VanFossen, 2005.
- ⁵² Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006.
- ⁵³ Heafner, Lipscomb, and Rock, 2006.

-
- ⁵⁴ Goodlad, 1984.
- ⁵⁵ J. Finkelstein, Nielsen, and Switzer , 1993.
- ⁵⁵ Thornton and Houser, 1996; VanFossen, 2005.
- ⁵⁶ Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006.
- ⁵⁷ VanFossen, 2005.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 398.
- ⁵⁹ Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006; Heafner, Lipscomb, and Rock, 2006; Burroughs, Groce, and M. Webeck, 2005; Burstein, Groce and Webeck, 2005; Burstein, Hutton, Curtis, 2006.
- ⁶⁰ VanFossen, 2005.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., 398.
- ⁶² L. Boyle-Baise, M. Hsu, S. Johnson, S. Serriere, and D. Stewart, "Putting Reading First: Teaching Social Studies in Elementary Classrooms" *Theory and Research in Social Education* 36 (2008): 233-55.
- ⁶³ VanFossen, 2005
- ⁶⁴ Rock, Heafner, O'Connor, Passe, Oldendorf and Good, 2006.
- ⁶⁵ Heafner, Lipscomb and Rock, 2006.
- ⁶⁶ VanFossen, 2005.
- ⁶⁷ Boyle-Baise, Hsu, Johnson, Serriere, and Stewart, 2008.
- ⁶⁸ VanFossen, 2005, 401.
- ⁶⁹ K. O'Connor, T. Heafner, and E. Groce, "Advocating for the Social Studies: Documenting the Decline and Doing Something About It" *Social Education* 71 no. 5 (2007): 255-60.

An Overview of K-5 Social Studies Instruction in Indiana

In 2003, we conducted a baseline survey to determine the level of K-5 social studies instruction in Indiana classrooms. This study is designed to compare results with that first survey.

Please use the small incentive included in your study packet to enjoy a soft drink while you provide us with valuable information on your beliefs and practices regarding social studies instruction at your grade level. The questionnaire should take no more than 13 minutes to complete.

There are 2 parts to the survey, please be certain to complete both.

Remember that your response represents many other teachers at your grade level and in order to have the most accurate results, we must have a high response rate. Please take a few moments to complete the questionnaire.

Again, thank you for your valuable time.

Phillip J. VanFossen

Ackerman Professor of Social Studies Education
Ackerman Center
Purdue University

1. Before proceeding, please enter the 4-digit survey identifier located in the lower left-hand corner of the study envelope and in the introductory letter.

2. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following: How familiar are you with the Indiana Academic Standards for Social Studies (IASSS) for your grade level?

- ☐ Very familiar
- ☐ Somewhat familiar
- ☐ Vaguely familiar
- ☐ I know nothing about the IASSS for my grade level

3. To what degree does the IASSS for your grade level influence your instructional planning for social studies?

- ☐ I frequently consult the IASSS for my grade level when planning.
- ☐ I occasionally consult the IASSS for my grade level when planning.
- ☐ I rarely consult the IASSS for my grade level when planning.
- ☐ I almost never consult the IASSS for my grade level when planning.

4. How well does the social studies textbook for your grade level correspond with the IASSS for your grade level?

- ☐ My textbook corresponds very well to the IASSS for my grade level.
- ☐ My textbook corresponds well to the IASSS for my grade level.
- ☐ My textbook corresponds poorly to the IASSS for my grade level.
- ☐ My textbook corresponds very poorly to the IASSS for my grade level.
- ☐ I am not certain how well my textbook corresponds to the IASSS for my grade level.

5. What level of support does your building administration provide for your teaching the IASSS at your grade level?

- ☐ Administration provides excellent support for teaching the IASSS at my grade level.
- ☐ Administration provides adequate support for teaching the IASSS at my grade level.
- ☐ Administration provides little support for teaching the IASSS at my grade level.
- ☐ Administration provides no support for teaching the IASSS at my grade level.

6. What value does your building administration place on teaching social studies at your grade level?

- ☐ Administration places high value on teaching social studies at my grade level.
- ☐ Administration places some value on teaching social studies at my grade level.
- ☐ Administration places no value on teaching social studies at my grade level.
- ☐ I have been told not to spend time on social studies at my grade level.

7. Does your school/corporation have a social studies curriculum guide

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Have you attended a workshop on teaching the IASSS sponsored by one or more of the following (select all that apply)?

- ☐ Indiana Council for Economic Education (ICEE)
- ☐ Indiana Council for History Education (ICHE)
- ☐ Indiana Council for the Social Studies (ICSS)
- ☐ Indiana Department of Education (IDOE)
- ☐ Law-Related Education (LRE)
- ☐ Geography Educators' Network of Indiana (GENI)

9. How many minutes per week (on average) are you planning on devoting to social studies instruction during this academic year?

- ☐ 0-20 minutes per week
- ☐ 21-40 minutes per week
- ☐ 41-60 minutes per week
- ☐ 61-90 minutes per week
- ☐ 91-120 minutes per week
- ☐ 121-150 minutes per week
- ☐ more than 150 minutes per week

10. If social studies were added to the ISTEP series (at 4th or 5th grade), as required by PL 221-1999, how many minutes per week (on average) would you devote to social studies instruction?

- ☐ 0-20 minutes per week
- ☐ 21-40 minutes per week
- ☐ 41-60 minutes per week
- ☐ 61-90 minutes per week
- ☐ 91-120 minutes per week
- ☐ 121-150 minutes per week
- ☐ more than 150 minutes per week

11. Compared to 4 years ago, which of the following statements best describes the amount of time you devote to social studies instruction?

-
- ☐ Time devoted to social studies instruction has increased.
 - ☐ Time devoted to social studies instruction has decreased.
 - ☐ Time devoted to social studies instruction has stayed about the same.

12. Which of the following best describes your approach to teaching social studies topics and content?

- ☐ Social studies topics and content are integrated throughout my curriculum.
- ☐ Social studies topics and content are taught during a particular portion of each school day (or week).
- ☐ Social studies topics and content are taught when I have instructional time left over from other content areas.
- ☐ I rarely teach social studies topics or content.

13. During social studies instruction, how often do your students engage in the following:

	Almost daily	Frequently (1- 2 times/week)	Occasionally (2- 3 times/month)	Rarely (2-3 times/year)	Never
engaging in cooperative learning activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
completing textbook-based worksheets?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
listening to a lecture on social studies topics or content?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
developing group projects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
working with maps or globes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
using computer-based social studies games?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
watching videos or films?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
writing vocabulary definitions or answer questions from the textbook?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
participating in simulations and/or role plays?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
examining photographs, artifacts, or other primary source materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
completing an assignment that requires them to write text at least one paragraph long?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. During social studies instruction, how often do your students engage in the following:

	Almost daily	Frequently (1-2 times/week)	Occasionally (2-3 times/month)	Rarely (2-3 times/year)	Never
discussing core democratic values (e.g., common good, justice, individual rights, patriotism, diversity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
learning about the Indiana and US Constitutions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
discussing basic economic concepts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
discussing local, state, and/or federal government?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
discussing respecting other's rights to religious views and beliefs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
discussing taking personal responsibility for earning a living?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. In your social studies instruction, how often do you...

	Almost daily	Frequently (1-2 times/week)	Occasionally (2-3 times/month)	Rarely (2-3 times/year)	Never
...integrate children's or young adult literature (picture books, chapter books) to introduce or highlight a social studies concept or topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...engage in a read-aloud followed by discussion questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...integrate social studies topics or content into your reading or literacy instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Describe the Internet access in your classroom.

- ☐ I have a fast, reliable Internet connection and computer(s) in my classroom
- ☐ I have a slow, often unreliable Internet connection and computer(s) in my classroom
- ☐ I have no Internet connection but I do have a computer(s) in my classroom
- ☐ I have no Internet connection and no computers in my classroom

17. Describe the level of Internet training you have received:

- ☐ Multiple training sessions/workshops
- ☐ One training session/workshop
- ☐ No training

18. How often do you have students use the Internet...

	Almost daily	Frequently 1-2 times/week	Occasionally (2-3 times/month	Rarely (2-3 times/year)	Never
...during your <u>social studies</u> instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to <u>find and examine</u> primary source materials (e.g., maps, photographs, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to complete a <u>WebQuest</u> or other <u>inquiry activity</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to <u>take a virtual field trip</u> to an on-line museum.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to <u>collect information</u> for reports or projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
...to <u>communicate with</u> others (e.g., other students, expert historians, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Please indicate your level of agreement with this statement: "My primary goal in teaching social studies is to help students master basic facts, concepts and content."

- ☐ Completely agree
- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Moderately agree
- ☐ Moderately disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree
- ☐ Completely disagree

20. Please indicate your level of agreement with this statement: "My primary goal in teaching social studies is to help develop students' critical thinking and decision-making skills."

-
- ☐ Completely agree
 - ☐ Strongly agree
 - ☐ Moderately agree
 - ☐ Moderately disagree
 - ☐ Strongly disagree
 - ☐ Completely disagree

An Overview of K-5 Social Studies Instruction in Indiana: Part 2

This is the **second part** of the survey, and there are several open-ended questions at the end of the form. Please write out your short responses to these questions.

Remember that your response represents many other teachers at your grade level and in order to have the most accurate results, we must have a high response rate.

Again, thank you for your valuable time.

1. My classroom is:

- ☐ Self-contained (I am responsible for integrating all subject areas)
- ☐ Departmentalized (I am primarily responsible for teaching social studies for all students in my grade)
- ☐ Departmentalized (Someone else is primarily responsible for teaching social studies for all students in my grade)

2. My highest degree is:

-
- ☐ Bachelor's
 - ☐ Bachelor's plus 15 hours
 - ☐ Bachelor's plus 30 hours
 - ☐ Master's
 - ☐ Master's plus 30 hours
 - ☐ Ph.D. or Ed.D.

3. My licensure/certification path:

- ☐ I was licensed after attending a four-year teacher preparation program
- ☐ I was licensed as part of a Master's degree program
- ☐ I was licensed as part of post-baccalaureate program
- ☐ I was licensed through emergency certification
- ☐ I was licensed through an alternative program not listed above

4. Number of years I have taught:

- ☐ 0-2 years
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 6-10 years
- ☐ 11-15 years
- ☐ 16 or more years

5. How many college or university courses (i.e., 3-credit hour classes) have you taken in history or the social sciences (economics, geography, psychology, political science/government, sociology):

- ☐ 0-2 courses
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-8
- ☐ 9-11
- ☐ 11 or more

6. My gender:

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

7. My race/ethnicity:

-
- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
 - ☐ Asian/Pacific American
 - ☐ Black or African American
 - ☐ Mexican American or Chicano
 - ☐ Puerto Rican
 - ☐ Latin American or other Hispanic
 - ☐ White, non-Hispanic
 - ☐ Other

8. The socio-economic status of most students in my school is:

- ☐ High income
- ☐ Upper Middle
- ☐ Middle
- ☐ Lower Middle
- ☐ Lower

9. My school is located in a:

- ☐ Community school corp.
- ☐ County school corp.
- ☐ Suburban school corp.
- ☐ City/urban school corp.
- ☐ Town school corp.

10. Please indicate how you would rank order the following content/subject areas from most important (use 1) to least important (use 6):

- Reading/Language Arts
- Mathematics
- Science
- Social Studies
- Art/Music
- Health/PE

11. Please indicate how you believe your students would rank order the following content/subject areas from most important (use 1) to least important (use 6):

<input type="text"/>	Reading/Language Arts
<input type="text"/>	Mathematics
<input type="text"/>	Science
<input type="text"/>	Social Studies
<input type="text"/>	Art/Music
<input type="text"/>	Health/PE

12. In your opinion, why is it important to teach social studies at your grade level? What do students in your grade level gain from social studies instruction?

<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------

13. Please take a moment more to assist the researcher. Were there any questions that you expected to be asked, but were not? Do you have any additional input into the survey or the study? If you have nothing further, then THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME...

<div></div>	<div></div>
-------------	-------------